

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
WACO DIVISION**

|   |   |                              |
|---|---|------------------------------|
| REPEAT PRECISION, LLC,                                      | § |                              |
|   | § |                              |
| Plaintiff,  | § |                              |
|   | § |                              |
| v.  | § | Civil Action No. 6:21-cv-104 |
|   | § |                              |
| DYNAENERGETICS EUROPE GMBH,<br>and DYNAENERGETICS US, INC., | § | JURY TRIAL DEMANDED          |
|   | § |                              |
| Defendants.   | § |                              |
|   | § |                              |

---

**Repeat Precision's Unopposed Motion to Redact Certain Parts of the Initial Pretrial Conference Transcript**

Plaintiff Repeat Precision, LLC (“Repeat Precision”) files this motion to redact certain portions of the Initial Pretrial Conference transcript disclosing confidential financial information pertinent to licensing and confidential tool design information. DynaEnergetics Europe GmbH and DynaEnergetics US, Inc., (“DynaEnergetics”) do not oppose this motion.

The right to “inspect and copy judicial records is not absolute.” *Nixon v. Warner Commc’ns, Inc.*, 435 US 589, 597–98 (1978). The Court may seal records to protect commercial information under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(c). Courts have considered the terms of patent licensing agreements, pricing terms, royalty rates, and payment terms to be well within Rule 26(c)’s ambit. *See Apple Inc. v. Samsung Elecs. Co., Ltd.*, 727 F.3d 1214, 1221–22 (Fed. Cir. 2013); *In re Electronics Arts*, 298 Fed. App’x 568, 569–70 (9th Cir. 2008); *Boucher v. First Am. Title Ins. Co.*, 2011 WL 5299497, at \*5 (W.D. Wash. Nov. 4, 2011); *Mosaid Techs. Inc. v. LSI Corp.*, 878 F. Supp. 2d 503, 510 (D. Del. 2012). Similarly, the Supreme Court explained in *Nixon* that “the common-law right of inspection has bowed before the power of a court to ensure that its records” do not “serve as . . . sources of business information that might harm a litigant’s

competitive standing.” *Nixon*, 435 US at 598. Because, Repeat Precision’s narrow redactions aim to protect its confidential financial information and its confidential tool design information, the Court should grant this motion.

Repeat Precision respectfully requests that the Initial Pretrial Conference transcript be redacted consistent with the highlighted portions of the transcript excerpts attached as Exhibit 1.

Dated: March 1, 2023

Respectfully submitted,

By: /s/ *Dinis Cheian*  
J. Hoke (“Trey”) Peacock III  
Texas Bar No. 15679380  
tpeacock@susmangodfrey.com  
Shawn L. Raymond  
Texas Bar No. 24009236  
sraymond@susmangodfrey.com  
Shawn Blackburn (pro hac vice)  
Texas Bar No. 24089989  
sblackburn@susmangodfrey.com  
Krisina J. Zuñiga  
Texas Bar No. 24098664  
kzuniga@susmangodfrey.com  
SUSMAN GODFREY L.L.P.  
1000 Louisiana Street, Suite 5100  
Houston, TX 77002-5096  
Telephone: (713) 651-9366  
Facsimile: (713) 654-6666

Dinis Cheian  
New York Bar No. 5958152  
dcheian@susmangodfrey.com  
SUSMAN GODFREY L.L.P.  
1301 Avenue of the Americas, Floor 32  
New York City, NY 10019  
Telephone: (212) 336-8330  
Facsimile: (212)-336-8340

**ATTORNEYS FOR REPEAT PRECISION**

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that on March 1, 2023, the foregoing document was served on all counsel of record via the Court's ECF system and/or via email.

*/s/ Dinis Cheian*

Dinis Cheian